

Variyur Salt Factory.

64. **MR. S. SUBRAHMANYA KARAYALAR** (*Pattanapuram cum Shen-cotta*): With reference to the Variyur Salt Factory, will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether the sums of Rs. 5,802 and Rs. 5,484 stated to be the revenues derived from the factory during 1099 and 1100 represent recoveries realised on sale of salt or the duty on such salt or both together;

(b) if they are either the duty, or the duty and recoveries together, whether the amounts represent the revenues derived from the factories;

(c) the actual revenues derived from the factory during 1099 and 1100 and the charges incurred thereon; and

(d) how they account for the great disparity between the actual revenues derived and the revenue of Rs. 25,000 per annum estimated by the Excise Commissioner, as evidenced by his statement (*vide* page 349 of the Proceedings of the second session of the first Legislative Council under Demand III)?

MR. P. N. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): (a) The revenue derived from the factory during 1099 and 1100 represents the duty and the recoveries in the case of salt sold by the Government and duty alone in the case of salt removed by the licensee during the respective years.

(b) Yes.

(c) The member is referred to the answers to parts (a) and (b) of question No. 244, asked by him at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 21st April, 1926.

(d) The Excise Commissioner's estimate of the yield of the factory at Rs. 25,000 per annum was based on the licensee's expectation that the factory would yield 10,000 maunds per annum. Further, the rate of duty prevailing at the time when the Excise Commissioner made the statement was Rs. 2-8 as. per maund which has since been reduced to Re. 1-4 as. per maund. Since 1099 incessant and unseasonable rains have adversely affected the progress of salt manufacture in the factory.

MR. S. SUBRAHMANYA KARAYALAR (*Pattanapuram cum Shen-cotta*): With reference to the statement of the Excise Commissioner that the yield will be 10,000 maunds every year, did the licensee undertake with the Excise Commissioner that the factory would yield 10,000 maunds every year?

MR. P. N. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): That is the expectation of the licensee.

MR. S. SUBRAHMANYA KARAYALAR (*Pattanapuram cum Shen-cotta*): Did he tell the Excise Commissioner about it?

MR. P. N. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): That is what the report says.

MR. S. SUBRAHMANYA KARAYALAR (*Pattanapuram cum Shen-cotta*): Has the Excise Commissioner ever estimated the capacity of the factory?

MR. P. N. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): Yes, he had some basis to proceed upon. In 1086 the factory yielded 9,332 maunds and hence the expectation of the licensee and the estimate formed by the Excise Commissioner were not without foundation.

Tinnevelly Salt.

65. MR. S. SUBRAHMANYA KARAYALAR (*Pattanapuram cum Shen-cotta*): (1) Is it a fact that the merchants of Alleppey have complained against the low quality of the Tinnevelly salt issued from the Port Salt Depot, Alleppey, and if so, have the Government or the Excise Commissioner enquired into the complaints and what is the result?

(2) Is the Tinnevelly salt supplied to the Alleppey Depot equal to the sample furnished by the supply contractor; if it is not equal to sample, have the Government taken action under the agreement towards reducing the contract rate?

(3) Are the Government aware that the supply contractor to the Alleppey Depot purchased about 30,000 maunds of British Government salt at Tuticorin at about 2 annas per maund and supplied the same to the Alleppey Depot, although such salt is powdered and is far inferior to the sample furnished by the contractor?

(4) Will the Government be pleased to place on the table a comparative statement for 1101 and 1102 showing the monthly consumption at Alleppey of Tinnevelly salt, for the months of Dhanu, Makaram, Kumbham and Minam?

(5) Is it a fact that the transport of Tinnevelly salt to the Alleppey Depot has been stopped temporarily, and, if so, why has it been stopped?

MR. P. N. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): (1) The question is vague as regards the time when such complaints are said to have been received. If the reference is to the contract for 1102, the answer is in the negative.

(2) If the member refers to the present supply contractor, some consignments were not equal to sample and necessary action has been taken under the agreement to reduce the supply price for these consignments.

(3) No.

(4) The statement asked for is subjoined:

	1101		1102
	Mds.	Srs.	Mds.
Dhanu	33,693	15	25,056
Makaram	27,290	17	23,956
Kumbham	19,885	1	25,048
Minam	30,017	19	25,772

(5) Yes; on account of heavy rains at Tuticorin. Supply was resumed after some time.

MR. S. SUBRAHMANYA KARAYALAR (*Pattanapuram cum Shen-cotta*): With reference to the answer to part (3), will the Government